

**BDAC Ecosystem Roundtable Meeting
11 April 1997**

Attendee List

Roundtable Members

Gary Bobker (<i>Bay Institute</i>)	Hari Modi (<i>N. Calif. Power Agency</i>)
Greg Gartrell (<i>Contra Costa W.D.</i>)	Jason Peltier (<i>CVPWA</i>)
Richard Golb (<i>N. Calif. Water Agency</i>)	Pete Phillips (<i>DFG</i>) [for Perry Hergersell]
Randy Kanouse (<i>EBMUD</i>)	Allen Short (<i>Modesto Irrigat. Dist.</i>)
Marc Luesebrink (<i>Resources Agency</i>)	David Yargas (<i>Environ. Def. Fund</i>)
Jackie McCort (<i>Sierra Club</i>)	Tom Zuckerman
John Mills (<i>Reg. Council of Rural Counties</i>)	

Other Participants

Anthony Barrett (<i>SEWD</i>)	Earl Nelson (<i>Western Area Power Admin.</i>)
Gilbert Cosio (<i>Murray, Burns & Kienlen</i>)	George Nichol (<i>ACOE</i>)
Cindy Darling (<i>CALFED</i>)	Jeff Phipps (<i>CVPIA Roundtable</i>)
Amy Fowler (<i>SCVWD</i>)	Michele Pla (<i>SF PUC</i>)
Rick Frank (<i>Attorney General's Office</i>)	Larry Puckett (<i>DFG, FWS, CVPIA</i>)
Kathy Freas (<i>CH2MHILL</i>)	Tim Ramirez (<i>Tuolumne R.P.T.</i>)
Leslie Friedman-Johnson (<i>Nature Conserv.</i>)	Robin Reynolds (<i>Calif. Dpt. Food & Ag</i>)
Kate Hansel (<i>CALFED</i>)	Pete Rhoads (<i>MWDSC</i>)
Diane Hinson (<i>Stockton-Muni. Util.</i>)	Gordon Sanford (<i>CMI</i>)
Steve Hirsch (<i>MWDSC</i>)	Wayne Sawka
Liz Howard (<i>USBR</i>)	Nancy Schaefer (<i>SF Bay Joint Venture</i>)
Jan Jennings (<i>_CCA</i>)	Edward Schmit (<i>Sugnet</i>)
Brenda Johnson (<i>U.C. Davis</i>)	Karen Schwinn (<i>U.S. EPA</i>)
Jordan Lang (<i>CALFED consultant</i>)	Pat Sheeh (<i>McLaren/Hart</i>)
Steve Kellogg (<i>Woodward-Clyde</i>)	Mark Siviveid (<i>City of W. Sacramento</i>)
Cheryl Langley (<i>DPR</i>)	Louise Steenkamp (<i>Brown & Caldwell</i>)
Eugenia Laychak (<i>CCPDR</i>)	Doug Wallace (<i>EBMUD</i>)
Brian Magudi (<i>EDAW</i>)	Scott Wilcox (<i>CALFED</i>)
Roger Masuda (<i>Turlock I.D.</i>)	Ray Zimny (<i>ACOE</i>)
Carl Mesick (<i>Stockton East Water Dist.</i>)	

Action Items and Decisions

1. The RFP will request projects for categories of restoration actions that are specific to the stressors and types of actions that have been identified and prioritized by the technical teams. The specific projects will not be described in the RFP, although examples may be provided.
2. Comments on the project criteria handout should be provided to Cindy Darling by April 18.
3. There is a Umbrella Technical Team meeting on April 18 to begin work on the workplan.
4. The project criteria provided in the meeting packet will be finalized at a Roundtable meeting on April 30.
5. Roundtable members need to consider the specificity of potential project descriptions in the RFP prior to the April 30 meeting.
6. There will need to be Roundtable meetings during July and August.
7. Comments on the Restoration Reserve criteria should be provided to Cindy Darling by April 18.
8. A description of the Restoration Reserve funding process will be drafted by CALFED staff.
9. Rich Golb will provide input on how to address projects of opportunity that are not necessarily driven by funding constraints or flood related events but where a construction season could be lost if funding is not made available in advance of the August timeframe.
10. The May 9 Ecosystem Roundtable meeting will be all day (9:30 to 4:00).
11. The CALFED Management Team and the BDAC chair will consider the addition of Martha Davis of the Sierra Nevada Alliance to the Roundtable.
12. There will be a CALFED workshop for the upper watersheds on May 29.
13. Greg Gartrell or Jason Peltier will chair the next meeting.

Future meetings of Roundtable are as follows:

Wednesday, April 30, 1:00 p.m.-3:30 p.m.
Friday, May 9, 9:30 a.m.- 4 p.m.
Friday, June 13, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

Friday, July 11
Friday, August 8

Draft Meeting Notes

Gary Bobker began the meeting at 9:40 with introductions. This will be the end of Gary's rotation as chair. Either Greg Gartrell or Jason Peltier will chair the next meeting (it depends on which one loses the coin toss).

The status of the planning process for the Ecosystem Roundtable was reviewed by Cindy Darling. At this point in the process, all five technical teams have met (San Joaquin, Sacramento, American, North Bay, and Delta). Input has also been received from the Central Valley Habitat Joint Venture regarding seasonal wetlands, the CALFED Water Quality Technical Team, and the IEP Contaminant Effects Workteam. The target date for an RFP (or series of RFPs) is mid-May. Decisions about specific projects are expected in early August.

PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

Cindy reviewed the criteria listed under the heading "Draft Project Evaluation Criteria" on page 4 of the meeting packet, including the general categories of criteria to be used to rank projects and the criteria all projects must meet. Evaluation questions for proposals were reviewed (pages 5 and 6 in the meeting packet). The criteria include biological effectiveness, applicant's capabilities, local support and cost sharing, consistency with CALFED goals, potential impacts and benefits, and cost effectiveness. In response to questions about the specificity of the RFP regarding restoration actions, it was noted that the RFP will have categories of actions that are specific to particular stressors. The applicants will not be limited to only those actions discussed by the technical teams but can propose actions which they feel will best address the stressors and priority species and habitats. The question was raised regarding the balance between the "low hanging fruit" type of actions versus more innovative and "critical path" types of actions. Both types of restoration actions are expected to be proposed under the RFP, and the criteria for project selection will reflect this. The RFP will have examples of types of actions to help guide the process, but will not lay out the specifics. It was noted that citation of the ERPP general principals, especially the focus on the restoration of natural process, may be helpful within the RFP to help guide applicants toward appropriate types of restoration actions.

A concern was expressed that a long history of complex contracting regulations may preclude many smaller groups from being able to respond to the RFP. It was noted that the two-step process that is being used for soliciting restoration actions will allow for a variety of ideas to come forth from many different types of groups. There is some progress being made on developing an effective, efficient contracting process. Further discussion of the selection criteria included the following questions and comments which were raised by Roundtable members and members of the audience.

- How will performance criteria be factored in? The approval process can be structured in phases in order to allow for quality control. The project proponent would need to demonstrate progress in order to receive payments.
- Is there a mechanism for determining cost effectiveness? Or is the evaluation simply on overall costs? There are two levels of cost effectiveness:

1) Between different proposals for the same type of action, and 2) between different types of actions.

- Cost effectiveness criteria are not based on a strict Cost/Benefit ratio analysis.
- Selected editorial changes were noted on pages 4 and 5. Comments on the criteria should be transmitted to Cindy Darling before April 18 in order to generate a final criteria list by May 9.
- Criteria need to be added regarding the structure and timeline for monitoring programs, specifically wetlands monitoring.
- In addition to the initial cost of the project, associated costs such operations and maintenance, monitoring, and other indirect costs need to be considered during the life of the project.
- Projects should have a criteria for how data on their effectiveness is to be evaluated and in what forum it will be evaluated.
- There will be significant scrutiny of the projects by the public and at the legislative level, so evaluation of project performance will be critical.
- Uniformity in monitoring is needed between new programs and projects that is compatible with other ongoing monitoring efforts.
- Implementability and project status (is it “ready to go”) criteria are needed. The readiness of the project is a relative criteria that is dependant on the type of project. All projects will have the criteria of meeting CEQA and NEPA requirements. Funding will be available for this regulatory process, but the applicants are responsible for complying with the regulations.
- The criteria reference to Category III is intended to be a demonstration of the applicant’s ability. It is not meant to be a prequalification for any new funding. Previous funding from CVPIA or Category III is not a prerequisite for future funding and does not ensure future funding.
- The criteria should include specific guidelines for monitoring requirements.
- The implementability of the project and its readiness should be considered as a criteria.
- Treatment of cumulative impacts of a project was cited as a potential roadblock to a large number of individual projects. Since the overall Programmatic EIS/EIR will not be completed when individual projects begin, care must be taken that a cumulative impacts challenge to individual projects will not create a roadblock.
- There needs to be a comprehensive tracking system for the applications, their status, progress, decisions, etc.

Cindy concluded the discussion by asking for general comments on the criteria and any editorial comments by April 18. Comments can be e-mailed to Cindy at cdarling@water.ca.gov. Comments regarding the project criteria should consider the following.

1. Should other general categories of criteria be added?
2. Are there other criteria that should be used?
3. Are the general principals cited in the criteria appropriate?

WORKPLAN DISCUSSION

There will be an Umbrella Team meeting on April 18 to address the workplan. The Umbrella Team will be asked to standardize the various terms and integrate the findings of the various

geographical technical teams. Cindy reviewed the San Joaquin technical team document that was handed out at the meeting. Comments on this document included the following.

- Concern was expressed regarding inclusion of the AFRP goals for salmon. These goals have not been extensively reviewed by the public and there is not consensus on them at this point. Staff noted that use of the general goals of the AFRP was designed to present a general magnitude of level of restoration needed and did not represent any more than that.
- It was noted that the different subgroups tend to use different terms, lifestyles, etc. in their work, and it will be up to the Umbrella Team to resolve some of these disparities.
- A question was raised regarding whether ecosystem functions are adequately addressed in the stressors. It is staff's belief that they are.
- A question was raised regarding labels being used for different stressors and whether they come out of the ERPP. There will be some standardization of these labels in the workplan.
- Questions were raised regarding hatcheries as a stressor. This is a sensitive issue, and David Yargas circulated a letter from four of the Ecosystem Roundtable members to Jaqueline Schafer regarding this question. Policy questions regarding the role of hatcheries will be addressed at the next Roundtable meeting.
- Questions were asked regarding comments on the ranking exercise used for the San Joaquin technical teams. It was noted that the prioritizing process for the actions at this first workshop was relatively loose, and became more structured in subsequent workshops. It was noted that there is a need for more qualifiers with any ranking exercise to make the results more useful and self explanatory to the decision makers.
- Regarding a workshop report comment on measuring success of restoration actions, it was noted that there need to be several different measures of success given the available technology and constraints on evaluation of the actions.

Cindy Darling raised the issue how specific the Roundtable wants to be in describing potential projects in the RFP. Roundtable members need to consider this issue prior to the next meeting. Cindy also noticed that the technical team did not address the section of the San Joaquin River between Friant Dam and the Merced River, or other similarly broad issues. The Roundtable may need to address these at a later date.

Additional comments related to the an Joaquin Technical Team Workshop report included the following:

- The question was raised regarding whether there was consensus from the technical team members on the benefits of the projects that were described in the written descriptions available at the technical team workshop. It was noted that there was conceptual agreement on these projects, but they were not reviewed in detail.
- There was concern expressed regarding the need for more detail for the decision makers regarding the technical team perspective on the various benefits provided by the suggested restoration actions. It was noted that this level of detailed project description was not pursued in future workshops.
- There is a need for an overall assessment of the role of hatcheries in the system.

- It was noted that perhaps there needs to be a new summary written of what needs to be done in the San Joaquin Basin, incorporating the existing information from the technical team workshop report as well as new information and new issues in order to develop a coherent overall strategy. Cindy Darling responded that the current technical team process is challenging because we are attempting to implement restoration actions over the near-term that are consistent with a long-term strategy that has not been fully developed yet. In future funding cycles, it is expected that the ERPP and the Anadromous Fish Restoration Plan will be available and the near term funding can be more closely tied to these long term plans.
- It was also noted that there needs to be sufficient planning time in advance of the funding decisions that there can be resolution of some of the outstanding issues and a coherent development of strategy. For example, planning for next year's funding cycle should begin as soon as possible.
- It was noted that it is critical for the Umbrella Team to meld the various technical team inputs into a coherent overall strategy with clear direction and clear focus on priority issues.

SCHEDULE AND TIMING

The next Ecosystem Roundtable meeting will be on April 30 to finalize criteria for project selection and discuss additional policy issues. There will be a May 9 Roundtable meeting, and a CALFED policy group meeting on May 13. There will need to be Roundtable meetings in July and August prior to the mid-August proposal selection. There was some discussion of a desire to get some time sensitive projects implemented this year (i.e., fish screens) in a manner similar to the "projects of opportunity" funding mechanism. There is no process developed for these types of projects at this time.

RESTORATION RESERVE

Cindy Darling provided draft criteria and process for administering a reserve of restoration funds for projects of opportunity. The draft criteria for these projects is on page 12 of the meeting handout. It was noted that any of the first 3 criteria would be appropriate for this type of funding (i.e., the project meets criteria 1 or 2 or 3). Several of the restoration reserve examples were discussed, including how to make selection of any restoration reserve projects defensible and in line with the longer term goals of the program, as opposed to being a "popularity" contest. A question was raised as to whether the priorities are basically in response to funding driven issues, or biological ones. This comment was raised in relation to projects such as fish screens which may be biologically important to construct as soon as possible, but would not be precluded from being constructed in a future construction season. They have a short in-water construction period that can be utilized. Other comments that were raised regarding the restoration reserve included the need to consider precedents that may conflict with careful planning of projects, and the possibility of establishing a funding availability limit for the reserve.

Any comments on the restoration reserve criteria should be transmitted to Cindy Darling by April 18. Rich Golb will provide input on criteria for projects of opportunity that may not be funding driven. A process description of the restoration reserve funding process will be drafted by

CALFED staff. There was a comment that projects of opportunity will be "recognized when they are seen."

PUBLIC INFORMATION WORKSHOPS

Kate Hansel reviewed the meeting packet handouts (pages 9-11) and gave a presentation on the planned workshops. The public workshops for the Sacramento River system, San Joaquin River system, and Delta are planned for the week after release of the RFP to publicize the opportunity, inform the public, and increase the quality and quantity of proposals. Discussion about the workshops include the following items.

- Questions were raised about the Ecosystem Roundtable involvement in this proposed process. The comment was made that the Roundtable members should get the public information mailings so they are kept informed.
- A question was raised regarding plans for any advertisement in the local papers prior to the meetings. Staff felt this would not be necessary, since the individuals that would be attending would already be aware of the upcoming funding opportunities.
- Regarding the Delta meeting, a location has not yet been selected, and concerns were expressed that perhaps the meeting should be held closer to the North Bay or in the Bay Area.
- There was a comment that public information staff need to be involved in these meetings.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

There have been few additional comments on the latest draft of the needs assessment. Progress is being made with NFWF as the funds administrator. The NFWF Board has agreed that they will not approve individual projects, but their staff will be involved in contract administration. They demonstrated good capabilities for of this type of work for the US Bureau of Reclamation on the spring run funding process. A NFWF contract with the Resources Agency will specify the rules and constraints of the respective parties.

An administrative staff person is being hired by CALFED for tracking and administration of the proposals. In addition, a CALFED consultant staff person will be joining the group to assist Kate Hansel during Cindy Darling's absence this summer.

David Yargas cited a number of administrative concerns regarding the process the Roundtable is going through, additional needs, the number of meetings and their expected length, etc. Cindy Darling encouraged Roundtable members to communicate with staff regarding any ways they can better assist the Roundtable to complete its work. It was noted that the oversight and expertise needs from Roundtable members and their organizations will evolve from the current biological and technical focus to other areas as well.

FUTURE MEETINGS AND AGENDA ITEMS

The next meeting of the Roundtable is on April 30, in the afternoon after the Ecosystem Restoration Work Group. There was discussion of a need for a longer meeting, perhaps on May 9. The May 9 meeting should be scheduled as an all day meeting (9:30 to 4:00).

There was brief discussion regarding the Sierra Nevada Alliance. There is a request for a seat on the Ecosystem Roundtable by the Alliance, with Martha Davis as the designated representative which is being considered. Regardless of Martha's ultimate role, it was noted that she should be getting Ecosystem Roundtable information as a liaison to the group. Discussion of adding Martha Davis as a representative of the Sierra Nevada Alliance received positive comments from the Roundtable members present.

On May 29 there will be a CALFED workshop on the role of upper watersheds and their involvement with the CALFED process. The CALFED staff lead for this group is Judy Heath. The workshop will be focused on watershed management and will include presentations and participation of various watershed groups. John Mills is a source of information regarding the variety of potential projects in the upper watersheds.

Jeff Phipps provided a brief update on the CVPIA program.